

RECEIVED

MAY 19 2022

RICHARD W. NAGEL, CLERK OF COURT
COLUMBUS, OHIO

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT OF OHIO

Ex Parte Harry William Lott

)
)
)
) 1st Amendment

) 8th Amendment

) 14th Amendment
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

NO:

2:22 CV 2219

JUDGE MARBLEY

MAGISTRATE JUDGE DEEVERS

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT



Ex Parte

Harry William Lott

2680 Sealy Ridge Road

Vincent, Ohio 45784

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Parties.....3

FRCP.....3

Subject Matter Jurisdiction.....3

Harry William Lott Background.....3

Harry William Lott is Seeking Judicial Review.....4

 The administrative agency lacks the power to grant effective relief; or.....4

 The exhaustion would be futile because the administrative body is biased.....5

Harry William Lott: First Amendment: Issues 1.....6

 Freedom not to association6

Harry William Lott: First Amendment:t Issues 2.....6

 Vexatious litigator issues.....6

Harry William Lott: First Amendment: Issues 3.....7

First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti, 435 U.S. 765 (1978).....7

 Commercial Speech Doctrine.....7

 Issues.....7

 Four-part test.....7

 Application to the law: non-law degree states.....7

Harry William Lott: First Amendment: Issues 4.....10

 Freedom of Religion.....10

 Definition.....10

Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398 (1963).....10

 What is a religious belief.....11

Issues.....11

Application to the law.....11

Harry William Lott 14 Amendment: Equal protection.....11

Harry William Lott: 8th Amendment: Cruel and Unusual Punishment.....11

Conclusion.....12

Index.....13

Parties

Judge: Must state that they have the required law license and elected appointment before the trial

Prosecutor: Must state that they have the required law license and elected appointment before the trial

FRCP

FRCP 4 (i) (2) parties and 19 FRCP (a)(2) Joinder by Court Order

Ohio Bar admission 1700 Lake Shore Dr., Columbus, OH 43204

FRCP 4 (i) (1) (A) (i)

U.S. Attorney's Office 303 Marconi Boulevard, Suite 200 Columbus, OH 43215

FRCP 4 (i) (1) (B)

Attorney General of the United States at Washington 950 Pennsylvania Ave NW Ste 7141,
Washington, DC 20530

Reason for a hearing

The Ex-Parte moving party is seeking to break the law (by giving legal advice and others said criminal) to give a given jury trial to hearing the issues. The moving the party is ready in violation of the Ex Post Facto laws for communicating to the judge. He demands a **trial by jury and public defender**.

The administrative agency lacks the power to grant effective relief, or

The Ex Parte is seeking moving or the Ohio Bar for a lack of agency power to grant effective refile on a the Ohio Supreme court or the Federal Court can exercise the Mandamus judgment (28 U.S. Code § 1361). So the plaintiff is seeking, a mandamus judgment from the Southern District Court.

The exhaustion would be futile because the administrative body is biased

The Ex Parte is seeking that the exhaustion would be futile because the administrative body is biased. The reason for this is that all of the Ohio Bar Association is appointed by ABA Juris Doctor degree holders which have more bias to the law school than the first amendment. The fact that judges allow a lawyer to represent his law firm and declare the Ex Parte Vexatious litigator. The fact, that the case needs a case number before issues can be raised before the Ohio Supreme Court will hear a case is it also an. The issue is: that if the bar will not give a case number then the case cannot be legally adjudicated. The Ex parte has been waiting for case numbers and appeal--and has received nothing. This is in direct violation of Due Process, which is covered in the 14 Amendment.

Background of Harry William Lott

The Ex Parte Harry William Lott allegiances that the Ohio State Bar discriminations against him, violates his First Amendment (Commercial Speech); Free Exercise Clause (religious auditing as a Scientology) and Fifth Amendment (Due Process). The Ohio Bar failed to be a neutral decision-maker based on their conduct of the United State Constitution meaning instead reflected their decision on the Ohio bar "General Requirements" rather than is religious beliefs. Where a discrete observer may conclude that a decision-maker has adjudged the facts and law of a particular case before hearing it, that decision marker must be disqualified Cinderella Career & Finishing Sch., Inc. v. FTC - 138 U.S. App. D.C. 152, 425 F.2d 583 (1970). The interest in

relying on ABA education as the only means of meaning state requirements. Parties with a sustainable pecuniary interest in legal proceedings should not adjudicate such disputes Gibson v. Berryhill, 411 U.S. 564 (1973). This Ex Parte claim will show other forms of other education are in conflict with the other state that grants education (e.g. law office studies or judge studies.) to the same state that is reflected in other states and religions education by **Scientology using Auditing¹** to the Ohio Bar Exam.

Not only does this consdicted the law of admission by other states that are reflected in the claim.

It is also a violation of the commerce clause: Article 1 § 8 Clause 3 of the U.S.. Constitution.

Whereas, the claim is in fact commercial speech and commercial education.

The Ex Parte was never heard in an administrative hearing to show that he has more proof and issues (to be truthful to the application), to the singrin of the Ex Parte there was no hearing.

Background of Defendant

Harry Willaim Lott: First Amendment:Issues 1

Freedom not to association

Does the Ex Parte have the right to association with the NCBA, Based on the religious issues later in this case. He states he does have the right not to be associated with an NCBA and Ohio bar application based. In the Keller case, 21 California attorneys sued the State Bar, objecting to the agency's use of its members' dues to fund political and ideological activities that the members did not support. The attorneys argued that such use of their compulsory dues violated their right to freedom of speech and freedom of association, or more precisely, the freedom not to associate. under the First Amendment, as applied to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment Keller v. State Bar of California 496 U.S. 1 (1990). The issue here is that the Ex Parte does not agree with the

¹ The plaintiff sued auditing to uncover that he has met the Ohio Bar requirements; thus, has the right to be licensed based on a protected religions education and training based on scientology.

fact that the Ohio bar NCB and MPRE are engaging in lobbying for a JD ABA degree for admission to the Ohio Bar which violates the First Amendment.. The Ex Parte does not agree with the action the bar and court took against him to apply for application; however, he has the right to be licensed under the Fourteenth Amendment in Keller's decision.

Harry William Lott: First Amendment: Issues 2

Vexatious litigator issues applied to Bill of Attainment

How does this apply to the case? Abridging the Freedom of speech. Redress of grievance is where the state the issues to raise to the level of a standard lawsuit for the state presiding state, including the Ex Parte has no right to petition the government for a redress of a grievance or it may make any laws that are disgraced with this law. Because these law is going to be issued many times, the law required doing illegal acts rather compared to courtroom actions This law is the Bill of Attainment under the U.S. CONST. Art.1. § 9. The Vexatious Litigator law bars a jury trial and right to counsel which is a violation of US Constitution because it relies more on the judge's opinions other than jury trial under the Seventh Amendment. **The plaintiff has a right to exercise his religion in the court based on the L. Ron Hubad and his teaching².**

Harry William Lott: First Amendment: Issues 3

Freedom of Speech: Commercial Speech

Central Hudson Gas & Electric v. Public Service Commission, 447 U.S. 557 (1980)

Central Hudson Test

² The purpose of the suit is to harass and discourage rather than win. The law can be used very easily to harass, and enough harassment on somebody who is simply on the thin edge anyway, well knowing that he is not authorized, will generally be sufficient to cause professional deacease. If possible, of course, ruin him utterly.

— L. Ron Hubbard, The Scientologist, a Manual on the Dissemination of Material, 1955

Under *Central Hudson*, there is a four-part test for whether governmental regulation of commercial speech is constitutional.

First, is the speech protected by the First Amendment? Is the asserted government interest substantial? Is there a standard for issuing substantial interest? First, in the *Clark* case, the court ruled that there was a content neutral insert in the case sleeping on a bench on the park because it was government interest *Clark v. Community for Creative Non-Violence*, 468 U.S. 288 (1982).

Second, An example of a content neutral event was regional acts that were content neutral and were allowed to break the law for Religious reasons *Heffron v. International Society For Krishna Consciousness, Inc.* 452 U.S. 640 (1981). The act that requires the religion exemption to the law would depend context neutral. In this case, the case of issuing a religion exemption would be content neutral. The Ex Parte depend that he had a religious right to break the law in accord to the no having a ABA Juris Doctor based on the religious right of scientology auditing³, which is a religious act.

Fourth, “....[s]econd, the alleged governmental interest in regulating the speech must be substantial.” *Central Hudson Gas & Electric v. Public Service Commission*, 447 U.S. 557 (1980).

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. It is a law that is the fundamental element of what the United States was found on was the right to have one voice heard *Central Hudson Gas & Electric v. Public Service Commission*, 447 U.S. 557 (1980).

³ www.scientology.org/faq/scientology-and-dianetics-auditing/what-is-auditing.html

Fourth, is the regulation more extensive than is necessary to serve that asserted? To satisfy strict scrutiny, the government must show that the law meets a compelling government interest and that the regulation is being implemented using the least restrictive means R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, 505 U.S. 377 (1992). The court would have used the least restrictive means in applying their sciutiy to this Ex Parte claim.

Oh..Const. § 11

Every citizen may freely speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of the right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech, or of the press. In all criminal prosecutions for libel, the truth may be given in evidence to the jury, and if it shall appear to the jury, that the matter charged as libelous is true, and was published with good motives, and for justifiable ends, the party shall be acquitted.

First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti, 435 U.S. 765 (1978)

Does the Massachusetts law that prohibits corporations from speeding money to influence referendums violate the first and fourteenth First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti, 435 U.S. 765 (1978)? Yes.. Does the ABA influence on the ruling making influence law to state of Ohio Bar admission to the bar? Yes, based on that payment is a required to becoming ABA Approved and approve for their lawyers⁴. Those Fees and law school fees to become approved for the Juris Doctor program⁵. The ABA is set up to influence Bar admission and influence a referendum to violate the first and fourteenth Amendment.

Third, the regulation must directly advance the governmental interest asserted. The bar admission does not advance the government interest based on the violation of the First

⁴/www.americanbar.org/membership/dues_eligibility/

⁵ www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/accreditation/schedule-of-law-school-fees/

Amendment: Congress shall make no.....abridging the freedom of speech; Congress shall make no laws....to petition the government for a redress of grievance.

How does this apply to the case? Abridging the Freedom of speech. How does this apply to the case? Redress of grievance is where there is a pure right that whenever the issues raise to the level of a lawsuit the state, including the State of Ohio, has no right not to hear a petition denial.

Application to the law of non law degree states

California⁶, Vermont⁷, Virginia⁸, Washington⁹, New York¹⁰, Maine¹¹, West Virginia¹². Wyoming¹³

Based on the requirement that these laws form this state that these States are over Vagueness under the First Amendment. These states do not require a law degree to be admitted to practices. The fact that Ohio requires a JD ABA Degree is in effect a “Chilling Effect” to the other states that require no law degrees at all.

Harry William Lott: First Amendment: Issues 4 Freedom of Religion

Free Exercise Clause to prevent going from outlawing or seriously burdening or person's pursuit of whatever religion and what (are religious practices) they choose. The plaintiff believes that his religious right to take the Ohio bar and its an application to become an Ohio Bar Member was described based on **Scientology's Auditing**. This practice is the main part of the practice of the religion, without any degree or licensee requirements.

⁶ <https://www.calbar.ca.gov/Admissions/Requirements/Education>

⁷ <https://www.vermontjudiciary.org/attorneys/admission-vermont-bar>

⁸ <https://www.vsb.org/pro-guidelines/index.php/reciprocity/>

⁹ <https://www.wsba.org/for-legal-professionals/join-the-legal-profession-in-wa/lawyers/qualifications-to-take-the-bar-exam>

¹⁰ <https://www.nybarexam.org/Eligible/Eligibility.htm>

¹¹ <https://mainebarexaminers.org/reciprocal-admission/qualifications/>

¹² <http://www.courtswv.gov/legal-community/rules-for-admission.html#rule2>

¹³ <https://www.courts.state.wy.us/supreme-court/bar-admission/>

Free Exercise Clause

Freedom of Speech. to prevent the government from outlawing or seriously burdening a person's pursuit of whatever religion (and whatever religious practices) he chooses.

Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398 (1963)

Requiring that a six-day work week was infringed on a religious holiday and the application to quit her job had a right to receive unemployment benefits Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398 (1963). A religious right excised in that law contradicted a religious belief to receive unemployment benefits found to be unconstitutional for that member to receive government benefits. This case is used as a law that is found to be unconstitutional that members have the right to receive benefits for government membership. The question to apply to the bar is one religion's right to receive the benefit of speech for one admission for religion exercise.

Harry William Lott: 14th Amendment: equal protection

The Court also ruled that a state statute that required Amish children to attend school past the eighth grade violated the substantive due process rights, and the religious freedom rights, of Amish parents to direct the educational and religious upbringing of their children. Wisconsin v. Jonas Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972). What this case shows is that the right of due process of the Fourteen Amendment to choosing one religion does not violate a law in relationship to education. In Yoder, the party was allowed to break the law for religious-related requirements. Plaintiff says that his right to Auditing as Scienceology and that right is religious education. The plaintiff is also arguing that any and all documents pertaining to the case are in direct conflict with the rebuttable presumption doctrine. Here if the plaintiff does not have a right to rebuttal a claim in a hearing then that statute retaining that law is struck down Bell v. Burso, 402 U.S. 535 (1971). Addressing why the Ex Parte is missing docs could have been handled in the

course of handling. Thus, **be allow to apply religious acts to rule-breaking. That is the use of scientology as an education meeting the general requirement of the bar (aka Juris doctor, JD).**

Religious right

1st Amendment: Not to the Association

Does Alabama's order to the NAACP to produce its membership list violate the Due Process Clause of the 14th amendment.? Yes, this order interfered with the Right to an association that is necessary to effective advocacy.

Does the defendant have the right to an association that is necessary for effective advocacy? The question does the right to advocacy apply to that of the advocacy of non-bar actively for the process for violation of Model Rules of Professional Rules of conduct. That the question is the right to question whether an issues of adequate legal representation under the Sixth Amendment. Diligence on cases timeliness aspect of competence under MR 1.1 and MR 3.2.

8th Amendment: Cruel and Unusual punishment

The Eighth Amendment's Cruel and Unusual Punishment Clause prohibits excessive fines, but courts rarely have found a fine to violate this provision. This is called Indentured Servitude.

Conclusion

Based on the Mandamus judgment the Ex Parte Harry William Lott is requesting a Yale law degree and an Ohio law license based on the formation claims. Also, he is seeking a Bachelor's Degree from Harvard Business school under equal protection to avoid being discriminated against by other degree holders from Regionally accredited based on his National accredited

degree that can't apply to law school¹⁴. The Ex Parte see the Ohio general requirements as a walking contradiction to the bar admission based on the for mention issues that has overstepped it right under the Constitution of the United States.

¹⁴ <https://www.utoledo.edu/graduate/prospectivestudents/admission/guidelines.html>

Index

Cases

<u>Bell v. Burso, 402 U.S. 5353 (1971)</u>	11
<u>Central Hudson Gas & Electric v. Public Service Commission, 447 U.S. 557 (1980)</u>	8
<u>Cinderella Career & Finishing Sch., Inc. v. FTC - 138 U.S. App. D.C. 152, 425 F.2d 583 (1970)</u>	5
<u>Clark v. Community for Creative Non-Violence, 468 U.S. 288 (1982)</u>	8
<u>Keller v. State Bar of California 496 U.S. 1 (1990)</u>	6
<u>First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti, 435 U.S. 765 (1978)</u>	9
<u>R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, 505 U.S. 377 (1992)</u>	9
<u>Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398 (1963)</u>	10
<u>Heffron v. International Society For Krishna Consciousness, Inc. 452 U.S. 640 (1981)</u>	8
<u>Wisconsin v. Jonas Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972)</u>	11

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

<u>Sixth Amendment</u>	12
<u>U.S. CONST. Art.1. § 9</u>	7

Trial By Jury



The Supreme Court of Ohio

OFFICE OF BAR ADMISSIONS

65 SOUTH FRONT STREET, COLUMBUS, OH 43215-3431

CHIEF JUSTICE
MAUREEN O'CONNOR

DIRECTOR
GINA WHITE PALMER

JUSTICES
SHARON L. KENNEDY
PATRICK F. FISCHER
R. PATRICK DEWINE
MICHAEL P. DONNELLY
MELODY J. STEWART
JENNIFER BRUNNER

TELEPHONE 614.387.9340
FACSIMILE 614.387.9349
supremecourt.ohio.gov

January 13, 2022

Harry W. Lott
2680 Sealy Ridge Rd.
Vincent, OH 45784

Dear Mr. Lott:

The Office of Bar Admissions is returning your Applicant's Supplemental Character Questionnaire and other related documents because you do not meet the requirements of Rule I of the Supreme Court Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio ("Gov. Bar R. I"). Please note that Article IV, Section 2(B)(1)(g) of the Ohio Constitution grants the Supreme Court of Ohio exclusive jurisdiction to regulate admission to the practice of law in Ohio. The Ohio Supreme Court exercises this jurisdiction pursuant to Rule I of the Rules of the Government of the Bar.

Gov. Bar R. I, Sec. 1, clearly states that whether you are applying to sit for the Ohio Bar Examination, applying for Admission Without Examination, applying to transfer a UBE score or applying for any other form of admission, an applicant for admission to the Ohio Bar must have earned a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university and must have earned a J.D. from a law school approved by the American Bar Association.

In your application, you indicated that you are seeking an Ohio law license without obtaining either a bachelor's degree or a law degree and you are requesting the Court to waive both the exam and the cost to take the exam due to a religious exemption and First Amendment exemption. Because a person entering the legal profession must understand and have formal instruction on laws and rules, this requirement is not waivable. Please be advised that because it was determined that you do not meet education requirements, we did not further review your application for compliance with the rule.

Sincerely,
The Ohio Office of Bar Admissions